

COACH PATRICK MOURATOGLOU- A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

BY

JURABEK KARIMOV

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Communication

May 2023

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Nate French, PhD, Advisor

John Llewellyn, PhD, Chair

Ron Von Burg, PhD

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Literature Review</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1.1 Trust</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1.2 Motivation</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>1.3 Integrity</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>1.4 Symbolic Interactionism and Roles Theory</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Mouratoglou's Coaching Playbook–Anaylsis</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>2.1 A Foundation of Trust</i>	<i>24</i>
Video Anaylsis I: Courtside Chat with an Academy Player.....	25
Video Analysis II: Practice Session with the World's Greatest.....	34
<i>2.2 Motivation as a Mechanism</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Video Anaylsis: Irena Pavlovic, When a Player Tanks</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>2.3 The Functionality of Integrity</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Video Analysis I: Serena Williams, Partnership Origin Story</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Video Analysis II: Marcos Baghdatis</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Chapter 3: Conclusion</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	<i>66</i>

Abstract

In the world of tennis, Patrick Mouratoglou is arguably the most prominent coach on the professional tour. It is especially remarkable that he had successful partnerships with both male and female athletes, which underlines his unique feel for each individual player. His most outstanding partnership was between him and Serena Williams, as the duo was able to win 10 Grand Slam tournaments together.

In the following rhetorical analysis, I will examine Coach Mouratoglou's rhetorical methods and coaching strategies. In order to do so, I will specifically look at the elements of trust, motivation and integrity – and elaborate on how he utilizes each of them in his coaching practices.

I will do so by examining different parts from the Netflix documentary “The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life” and by analyzing coaching videos from his YouTube channel. Furthermore, I will shine light on his methods by using symbolic interactionism and role theory as a theoretical lens.

Introduction

Known best as an approachable, “life-long” game, tennis proves to be one of the ultimate individual sports of our time. It seems only natural that a critical element of this solo game is often overlooked. As players hit the court to compete on their own, the coaching aspect of the sport often flies under the radar when compared with other team sports such as basketball or soccer. The typical tennis coach, side-lined to the players’ box, has historically gone unnoticed by the public until recently. Due to new regulation now allowing coaches to actually coach their players during competition, the mystery around these figures falls aside as tennis audiences seek to understand the player-coach dynamic that makes or breaks the best players on the world stage.

Coaching in tennis might prove to have more of an impact on the athlete than in respective team sports, since coaches can offer personalized training to solo athletes, working to maximize strengths and eliminate weaknesses. By implementing the latter, coaches can get to know solo athletes more intimately than in team sports (Fresno Pacific University, 2021). Despite this, sparse research regarding the characteristics and qualities important in the formation of coaching relationships within the sport exists (Palmer, 2008).

Various coaching components determine whether a coach can have a positive impact on their client or not. Therefore, analyzing the communicative methods that appear in coaching can be of significant value to the field. The aim of coaching is to help individuals or groups become self-directed in their learning and development while focusing heavily on the improvement of an individual's cognitive and emotional self-regulation (Spence & Oades, 2011; Bennett & Bush, 2009). To accomplish this, a

coach must effectively connect with the player via a multitude of different communicative strategies.

Sullivan indicates that an athlete and coach speak the common language of the specific sport in which they are involved, but “the communication must be articulated in a fashion that the athletes will not only hear, but also instantly understand” (Sullivan, p. 44). Joe Torre, former Major League Baseball manager who led the New York Yankees to four World Series titles, emphasized that “communication is the key to trust, and trust is the key to teamwork in any group endeavor, be it in sports, business, or family” (Sullivan, p. 71).

Personally, I have been playing tennis all my life. Since a very early age, my dream was to become a professional tennis player and compete on the biggest courts in the world. My journey brought me into a grand slam final at the junior Australian Open, allowed me to travel the world, to compete in professional tournaments and to meet people from diverse cultures that remain a part of my life today. Tennis also taught me how to face adversity. Fighting through injuries and learning to get back up loss after loss has become part of my daily life as a tennis player.

Throughout this journey, I have had many coaches by my side—some that I did not see eye to eye with and the partnership ended, and some that brought me to the next level and resulted in a compatible relationship. That being said, I realized how crucial it is to have the right coach, and more so how important it is to have a right player-coach relationship to get to the next level, athletically speaking.

My tennis journey ultimately brought me to Wake Forest University, giving me the chance to compete for one of the most prestigious programs in the country. Even

during my time here, where I am no longer a full-time “professional” tennis player, interpersonal relationships with my coaches have significantly molded my experience as a student athlete for the better.

Since many coaches had such a strong impact on my personal life, my interest in coaching goes beyond just intrigue. As a matter of fact, I consider it a great possibility to start a coaching career myself after college. Therefore, analyzing the way in which the most decorated and successful tennis coach of all time operates with his players, is of significant value for me.

When Patrick Mouratoglou emerged as one of the most globally-known tennis coaches in the public, my interest was sparked. What set him apart from other coaches? How did he generate such publicity and build an empire within the tennis world? How did his communication and coaching style with the player impact his career? I believe that answers to these questions will have an impact on the field, as they identify communicative devices used by one of the most prominent coaches in the world of sports.

As founder and chair of the Mouratoglou Academy, Patrick Mouratoglou is one of today’s most influential coaches within the tennis sphere. Nicknamed “The Coach”, he is considered the gold standard instructor on the international circuit. Featured alongside coaching greats such as Jose Mourinho and Doc Rivers in the Netflix documentary “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life” Patrick’s respect and status as a coach is undeniable.

Mouratoglou’s first experience of coaching was with player Marcos Baghdatis. After finishing the year as Junior World No. 1, the Cypriot reached the Australian Open

final in 2006 to go head to head with Roger Federer. This was the high point of their partnership. However, not soon after, his relationship with Baghdatis began to sour. Retrospectively, he points to his certain coaching strategies and failed methods of communication that were the reasons that caused the partnership to end. Despite this, Patrick picked up the pieces and kept working his way through the tennis circuit, learning as he went. Mouratoglou notes that this difficult entanglement with a world class athlete became a pivotal shift for him as a coach. I will go into greater detail regarding this topic when analyzing how integrity is a necessary element of Mouratoglou's coaching playbook. First, I want to circle back to Mouratoglou's personal background that developed him into the unique coach he is today.

Mouratoglou's status as a coach is exemplified through the empire he built: a prestigious academy and global social media presence. A major piece of this international intrigue may be the fact that Patrick Mouratoglou was never a great tennis player himself. While he was competitive in junior tournaments, he failed to pursue professional tennis. When assessing the current tennis coaching scene, having a coach who never reached the professional stage in the players' box is certainly a rarity. This underscores the power Mouratoglou's methods have in achieving unique and outstanding results.

Not only was Patrick never successful on the court, he also struggled in interpersonal areas throughout his childhood and early adult years. Born in a small city in France, Patrick was a timid, fragile kid who lacked basic communication skills due to severe social anxiety. In the Netflix documentary *The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life*, Mouratoglou reveals that he was not able to have a conversation with any other kids in school. To underline this point, he states that it took him an entire year to say just one

word to his therapist. Mouratoglou also explains that this incredible weakness turned into a huge strength, as he learned how to observe and read people. To this day, he is profiting from that ability to get out more of his players by observing their body language and reading their behavior.

When he was the age of four, Mouratoglou picked up a racket for the first time. He describes this moment as “love of first sight”, and notes that tennis offered him an escape (Gouriellec, 2020). Not being a natural born communicator in combination with his not so impressive tennis career, makes it even more fascinating to understand the confidence Patrick operates with now when communicating with his players and with the media.

In an interview with TennisChannel, Mouratoglou reveals that his passion for tennis transformed into a dream while watching the French Open as a kid, the only tournament that was televised in France at that time. He explains how French tennis star Yannick Noah became his idol and sparked his vision of becoming a professional tennis player himself.

As a matter of fact, Mouratoglou states that he “never thought about doing anything else than becoming a tennis player.” He also really believes that he would have had the potential to become a good player himself. Despite that burning passion and that confidence in his own skills, his parents told him that it would be too risky to put everything on one card, and that they wanted him to continue with school, which basically meant that he had no chance in becoming a professional tennis player.

Mouratoglou explains that when that news was broken to him by his parents, he felt “angry and lost.” At age 11, Mouratoglou was talent-spotted by the Ile-de-France

Tennis League, and he went on to practice there as a teenager. A promising boy, the official recognition confirmed the likely scenario: he wanted to become a professional tennis player. However, in 1985, about to enter his junior year in high school, he asked his parents to be enrolled in a special program for young athletes, divided between classes and training.

His parents denied his request, which ultimately fueled his ambition to give young players the chance he never got himself. But before doing that, he took a step away from tennis for seven years, without even touching a racket during that time span.

Mouratoglou's father began working in renewable energies during the 1990's and became a pioneer in the field. He built his own successful company, and once Patrick finished school, his father offered him a job in his firm since Patrick "didn't know what else to do."

While starting as inexperienced, Patrick quickly worked his way up into a position that incorporated more responsibilities. After some years of experience, his father offered Patrick the chance to become a partner in his firm. This was the turning point in Patrick's career, because he denied his father's offer.

The reason why Patrick rejected his father's offer was that he did not want to miss out on his second and last chance to achieve something in tennis. He remembers his thought process during this decision: "I'm not gonna miss my second chance, I want to have a tennis academy. I'm gonna help players become professionals and top professionals because I couldn't do it myself, but I think I'm going to have an incredible pleasure helping others do what I could not do." Therefore, it was not until the age of 26,

that he would make his pivotal return back to the sport of tennis. After his career in business, he and another coach came up with the idea of building their own academy.

In 1996, in the suburbs of Paris, Mouratoglou finally started his academy. His first few players did not have the level of talent that he hoped his academy would represent. He envisioned a group of young players with ambition who needed help in order to reach the top of the game. Starting as basically a ‘nobody’ in the tennis world, he realized that in order to work with a more prestigious level of players, his academy needed status.

This is where legendary coach Bob Brett came into play. Through connections, Mouratoglou was able to get in touch with the star coach who coached tennis greats like Boris Becker, and convince him to lend his name for the academy. That being said, they landed on the name: Bob Brett Tennis Academy.

This move turned out to be a first hint of Mouratoglou’s incredible feel for branding and marketing. After Bob Brett gave his name and started working at the academy, the level of the players who joined the academy increased dramatically. In the first group of 20 players that came to work with Brett and Mouratoglou, many developed into decorated professionals—Paul-Henri Mathew, Gilles Muller and Ivo Karlovic to name a few.

After several years, Mouratoglou decided to purchase his own place. According to Patrick, while Bob Brett was a great coach in terms of technique and tactics, his leadership style was very different compared to his own. In the interview with TennisChannel, Mouratoglou describes Brett’s leadership style as “kind of like a dictator.” Here, Mouratoglou’s unique approach began to differ from the standard

coaching status quo as he focused on different attributes. Some of these attributes include trust, motivation and integrity—the three lenses through which I will present my analyses.

Again, Mouratoglou's path to the top tennis players in the world started with Marcos Baghdatis, who he discovered at a young age. Baghdatis was the first player of Patrick's new place that became a huge success—winning the junior world championships and reaching the Australian Open final at just 20 years old. In *The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life*, Mouratoglou describes his father-son relationship with Baghdatis as more than just a partnership between a coach and player. According to Mouratoglou, this was what made them so successful as a duo and perhaps, also complicated things over time.

Along the way, Coach Patrick helped develop several other promising prospect-players into established professionals. Mouratoglou's path finally led him to a partnership with tennis icon Serena Williams, who had reached out to Mouratoglou the day after crashing out of the first round of Roland-Garros. Williams had not won a major in two years and her goal was to “win one last Grand Slam tournament.” Working in tandem with Patrick, she went on to win ten more. Serena Williams still holds the Open Era record with 23 Grand Slam and a 310-week reign as World No. 1. She is unanimously considered the greatest female tennis player of all time.

All of Patrick Mouratoglou's success stories seem to be united in one aspect: a player-coach relationship that works beyond the confines of the historical, more business-like partnerships seen on the tour. In order to foster the results Mouratoglou is known for, a stronger bond and more intimate connection must be made. To foster this unique relationship with his players, knowledge about tennis technique or tactics alone is

not sufficient. Therefore, my thesis will examine how successful coaching relies on the attributes of trust, motivation and integrity.

I will analyze examples of Patrick Mouratoglou's interactions on and off the court with a great spectrum of players in order to explain how those attributes form the ultimate player-coach dyad. I will analyze the rhetorical methods and nonverbal strategies he uses with his players, in order to illustrate that Coach Mouratoglou's greatest success is not only due to his expertise and knowledge, but more-so his ability to utilize the right communicative tools within the scope of trust, motivation and integrity. In order to explain his success, I will use symbolic interactionism and roles theory as a theoretical framework, which will help in gaining a deeper understanding of these attributes.

Chapter 1: Literature Review

1.1 Trust

One of the key aspects that makes Mouratoglou the most popular tennis coach is his ability to build trust between himself and his players. In order to achieve coaching outcomes, trust must be established. However, though the role of trust in the coaching relationship seems to be implicitly understood, it remains mostly unexplored (Markovic, 2014). In light of this gap in knowledge, Markovic focused on contributing to trust development in the player-coach relationship by introducing a trust model based on three critical elements for trust development: ability, benevolence, and integrity.

Over the past decades, the business environment started recognizing the impact of trust on organizations' strategic success and its significant contribution on acquisition of competitive advantage (Castaldo, 2010). The research has generated considerable evidence on trust's numerous benefits for both individuals and organizations (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004). The importance of trust has been further recognized in leadership, performance management, job satisfaction, knowledge sharing, and organizational commitment (Castaldo, 2010). While a coach and player are not necessarily a business organization, research parallels can be drawn between trust elements within business organizations and within the player-coach dynamic.

Trust is a key element in every social interaction which provides the foundation for effective relationships (Reina & Reina, 2006). For example, professional relationships prove more productive and less costly when trust is established (Lount, 2006). The decision to trust an individual is a complex cognitive and affective process involving various factors, from estimates of potential costs versus rewards and personal

vulnerability to expectations of an individual's benevolence in an exchange characterized by future uncertainty (Kenworthy & Jones, 2009).

In the coaching setting, establishing a relationship of trust constitutes a first step in the coaching process that allows the relationship to grow and flourish while increasing the likelihood for elevated performance (Palmer, 2010). One of the top characteristics of an effective coaching relationship is the ability to form a strong connection with the client while achieving a fine balance between support and challenge (Bluckert, 2005).

In order for a player to take on the risks necessary to learn, develop, and change, the coach must cultivate a safe space through the development of trust. Only through trust can a player feel safe enough to reveal vulnerabilities, expose mistakes and deficiencies, and ultimately grow as an individual and an athlete. Though researchers have largely emphasized the positive sides of trust, the lack of trust in the coaching relationship leads to various negative implications (Palmer, 2010). This is why any discussion regarding the effectiveness of a coaching relationship acknowledges the importance of trust. Aside from being recognized and developed in the relationship, trust also has to be sustained throughout the process otherwise, it is difficult and costly to regain trust and reach a desirable productivity level (Caldwell & Jeane, 2007).

One well established model of trust is the "Integrative Model of Organizational Trust". According to this model, ability, benevolence and integrity are important antecedents of trust (Mayer et al., 1995; Schoorman et al., 2007). The implication of ability as an antecedent of trust is that it creates a framework of trust that is domain specific. The level of trust within the same relationship may vary based on the ability

across different domains. Accordingly, the approach to trust as domain specific enables the adaptation of the model in the coaching setting (Markovic, 2014).

Coaching with its broad application and interdisciplinary roots has advanced considerably in the past few decades (Griffiths & Campbell, 2009). The aim of coaching is to help individuals or groups become self-directed in their learning and development (Bennett & Bush, 2009). Coaching is concerned with improvement of an individual's cognitive and emotional self-regulation (Spence & Oades, 2011). Therefore, a client should be met with respect, cooperation, and trust which establishes the platform for the important coaching work to follow (Ives, 2012; McComb, 2012). Considering that, Peterson and Hicks (1996) have defined coaching as “the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective” (p.14).

Though vastly researched, trust remains an interpersonal phenomenon without universally adopted definition (Kramer, 1999; Lount, 2010; Righetti & Finkenauer, 2011). This is one of the reasons why the study of trust is considered to be problematic (Mayer et al., 1995). The most common definition represents trust as an individual's willingness to become vulnerable to another individual with some hope of a positive outcome (Lount, 2006; Mayer et al., 1995).

Another reason that may make the construct of trust difficult to define is the confusion between trust and its antecedents (Mayer et al., 1995). This results from using various terms like risk, cooperation, predictability, and confidence synonymously with trust. For example, trust is not equal to risk or taking a risk per se, but represents a willingness to take a risk. Trust leads to a risk taking in relationships and refers to a

person's awareness that something is jeopardized and could be lost if another person is not acting favorably (Righetti & Finkenauer, 2011; Schoorman et al., 2007).

According to Hatzakis (2009) trust has two foundations—cognitive basis and affective basis. Cognitive basis of trust is formed based on evidence, while affective trust is related to human emotions. Finding the right course of action requires an individual to form a judgment, and according to Hardin (2006), this judgment does not involve choice. For cognitive based trust, knowledge we gain about someone we want to trust determines whether we are going to trust that person.

When people trust, that means they know or think they know, just enough information needed for trust to develop. Therefore, wrong information could mislead people into trusting or distrusting. Generally, people trust over certain ranges of actions. This outlook on trust is based on rational theory that emphasizes the importance of interest. It states that trust is generated when a person has a reason to believe that it is in the other person's interest to be trustworthy in a relevant context (Hardin, 2006). From the rational standpoint, trust grows gradually between strangers and over certain ranges of actions, while the initial trust is low (Hardin, 2006; Lount, 2006).

A more recent approach to trust involves affective responses (Schoorman et al., 2007). According to this approach, emotional states have an effect on trust. For example, emotional attachment can cause the trustor to take a risk not necessarily warranted by any evidence. Proponents of the cognitive approach argue that even though emotions could affect trust, it is only temporary and soon after one would return to a rational perspective.

In Schoormann's model, a cognitive approach to trust is presented (2007). Established factors of trustworthiness or trustee's characteristics in that model are the

individual's ability, benevolence, and integrity. Perception about an individual's ability, benevolence, and integrity has an impact on how much trust one can generate (Mayer et al., 1995; Schoorman et al., 2007).

The ability factor refers to a set of competencies one has within a certain domain. This means a person could possess ability in one specific area and therefore be trusted with work in that area. This ability factor is closely connected with the area of expertise, which this thesis will also explore. It shows that trust as a foundation for successful coaching is dependent on other areas that reach beyond simple social skills.

The benevolence factor is represented as the extent to which a person is believed to have a good intention. This factor could be described as the trustee's positive orientation towards the trustor. The integrity factor is defined as abiding by a set of principles and being held accountable for following through (Mayer et al., 1995). The time dimension concerning these three factors varies. For example, a trustor's judgment on a trustee's ability and integrity forms quickly while benevolence takes more time.

All three trustworthiness characteristics are theoretically distinct but have an additive quality in determining the level of trust (Schoorman et al., 1996; Schoorman et al., 2007). Each factor is insufficient to cause trust unless all three factors are high. All three factors need to be considered in making a choice about trust.

Through the previously established conceptualization of trust, Marokovic (2014) developed a trust building model aimed toward a coaching context. The first trustworthiness factor, a coach's ability, relates to a set of skills and characteristics necessary for effective coaching. The coach utilizes a variety of behavioral science techniques and methods to help a client achieve job-related goals and improve

performance (Bennett & Bush, 2009). Technical expertise and problem solving skill are the two elements exemplifying a coach's ability factor (Sirdeshmukh, Singh, & Sabol, 2002).

Technical expertise refers to certification acquired via a professional coaching organization, completed formal coach training, or a master's and/or doctoral degree in a related field, such as psychology, communication, training, or adult development (Bennett & Bush, 2009). In Mouratoglou's case, this is especially interesting because his tennis resume is not as equipped as his colleagues'. This leads to the assumption that the aspects of benevolence and integrity are more dominant in his coaching style and way of building trust.

Nevertheless, problem solving skill represents an ability to solve and manage situations of conflict and to take into consideration all parties involved, both client's and employer's needs. A coach should constantly demonstrate the ability factor. According to Bluckert (2005) when the coach is perceived as incompetent, lacking skills and understanding to operate as a proper guide and safety net, the client is led to a real sense of anxiety. Anxiety, as a form of low emotional stability, leads to withholding of trust (Kenworthy & Jones, 2009). Also, induced anxiety may affect coaching transfer by undermining the client's motivation to learn (Stewart et al., 2008). Therefore, it is important for a coach to consistently exhibit the ability factor throughout the coaching process.

The second trustworthiness factor, benevolence, relates to a coach's intentions to serve the client's best interest. Sirdeshmukh et al. (2002) refer to benevolence as

“operational benevolence” which recognizes that motivation for benevolence needs to be operationalized and visible.

While exploring the client’s goals and views of the work situation, a benevolent coach would provide support, refrain from self-serving opportunism, express consideration for the client’s welfare through empathy and nonjudgmental behavior, and move beyond the conditions of the explicit contract. According to Bluckert (2005), coaches often find it difficult to take a non-judgmental approach and for the same reason many also have a problem expressing empathy. Therefore the benevolence factor in the coaching setting has the potential to be more challenging than the other two factors.

A benevolent coach should acquire a cultural familiarity that refers to the coach's familiarity with the client’s country of origin, its business practices, language, and political systems (Lee et al., 2007). For example, according to Mayer et al., (1995) cultural values influence an individual's cognition and since trust is based on a cognitive foundation we could assume that cultural background could potentially influence a client’s trust. Through an understanding of cultural knowledge, a coach is able to adapt to the client’s cross-cultural differences and to appeal to his/her way of thinking (Bluckert, 2005). As Mouratoglou’s visa shows, he worked with players from various different cultures which enforced his ability to adapt and show empathy.

The last trustworthiness factor, integrity, comes from reliable promises, sharing of valid information, and expressions of honesty. Integrity is marked by values like openness, sense of deep commitment, self-expression, honesty, respect, reliability, discipline, and personal responsibility (Kingley, 2005). Kingley proposed a process named ‘integrity mapping’ for maintaining and developing integrity. The process consists

of constant reflection and application of core values which build integrity. A person with integrity constantly takes time for reflection and daily analysis.

According to Markovic (2014), a coach's ability, benevolence, and integrity are equally important in gaining the client's trust. For example, the client may believe that the coach is able to provide a quality service, but that only ensures that the coach would be able to perform, but not necessarily be willing to perform. Also, the perception that the coach has integrity suggests fulfillment of the promised service, but if the coach's ability is questionable, again there will be no trust. Furthermore, if the coach is perceived as benevolent, but his/her track record with previous clients is inconsistent, again trust will be lacking. The client will most likely take all three factors – ability, benevolence, and integrity, into consideration before making a decision to trust.

1.2 Motivation

Psychological factors influencing tennis performance have long been recognized (Crespo, 2002). As American champion Jimmy Connors put it in 1981: “Tennis is 90% mental” (Weinberg, 1988). One of those “psychological factors” is motivation, which also attracted the attention of researchers. Taylor (1994) treated motivation as the base of a pyramid promoting success in tennis.

The research on motivation for athletes and how it connects to coaching expands in many different directions. One of the most important aspects to focus on when looking at Mouratoglou’s rhetorical coaching strategies is how they relate to autonomous behaviors. Using this as a theoretical framework, I will evaluate the autonomous-supportive behaviors Mouratoglou mobilizes in order to gain results from his players in my Chapter 4 analysis: Mouratoglou’s Coaching Playbook.

Continuing, it is obvious that coaches may look for athletes who have had this characteristic at a high level from the very beginning and therefore do not need much psychological intervention. Mouratoglou often mentions that he looks for players with a “deep self-belief and motivation” (The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life). Nevertheless, as I will evaluate in later chapters, Mouratoglou has the ability to form a sense of achievement and motivation within his players through different strategies.

The lack of psychological knowledge by coaches in the area of motivation is one of the main reasons for mistakes made in the talent identification process. It often causes disappointment of those players who are not predestined to practice high-professional tennis by the basics of their personality - these players who do not possess high level of

achievement motivation do not reach the highest levels of the game despite good results at a young age (Unierzyski, 2009).

Connected to that, without the desire to succeed other psychological features and abilities do not provide nearly so much influence on performance. Achievement motivation influences other factors affecting performance in sport: physical preparation, technique, tactics and even lifestyle (Gracz and Sankowski, 1995). People with greater achievement motivation prefer tasks and situations where they can influence the result and their actions are successful (Gracz and Sankowski, 1995). Such people continue longlasting insoluble tasks more effectively and reveal greater persistence (Atkinson and Feather, 1966).

These observations were confirmed in research on tennis players conducted by Butt and Cox (1992). The results indicated a higher level of achievement motivation among top class tennis players in relation to university players in the USA. Similar relationships were described by Schönborn (1984). On the other hand, the so-called negative motivation is characteristic of people with low achievement motivation, who are not confident and want to avoid failure. In a match situation it usually evokes excessive stimulation and lowers the quality of sports performance. In the long term this often leads to a lack of progress or even giving up practicing (Unierzyski, 2009).

Locke and Latham (1985) explained that an individual's level of success in athletic competition is primarily dependent upon skill and motivation. Therefore, a primary responsibility of coaches is to motivate their athletes to perform at optimal levels. Sage indicated motivation is the direction and intensity of an individual's effort.

Some coaches use motivational techniques when establishing their athletes' training regimens. One technique, which has been used to promote commitment, perseverance, dedication, and effort to create an individual's long-term self-motivation is goal setting . Locke states that an objective goal refers to “attaining a specific standard of proficiency on a task, usually within a specified time” (29, p. 145); while a subjective goal (e.g., I want to enjoy playing in the game) can be vague and difficult for coaches and athletes to measure.

As mentioned, I will enhance the aspect of motivation in the critical approach section, where I will describe self-determination theory as a theoretical framework in order to dive deeper into motivation as a driving force for an athlete's success.

1.3 Integrity

One consistency of research on integrity within the field is the conceptualization of integrity as something that can be viewed from different perspectives and can have different implications. In fact, there is little agreement in the literature about the meaning of integrity (Becker, 1998). It is frequently used to represent a wide variety of ideas and constructs and often overlaps with other terms such as morality, ethics, conscientiousness, honesty, and trustworthiness (Lowe, Cordery, & Morrison, 2004).

Similarly, Palanski & Yammarino (2007) note that many of the definitions of integrity overlap with one another and are used interchangeably, which leads to considerable difficulty when trying to operationalize, measure, and test integrity. They suggest that one way to address this problem is by considering integrity as a virtue (Audi & Murphy, 2006), which is defined simply as a discrete component of good character (Palanski and Yammarino, 2007). They also note that many of the definitions of integrity overlap with one another and are used interchangeably, which leads to considerable difficulty when trying to operationalize, measure, and test integrity.

For instance, Kingley (2005) calls integrity “the last trustworthiness factor.” He states that integrity comes from reliable promises, sharing of valid information, and expressions of honesty. Integrity is marked by values like openness, sense of deep commitment, self-expression, honesty, respect, reliability, discipline, and personal responsibility (Kingley, 2005).

Kingley proposed a process named ‘integrity mapping’ for maintaining and developing integrity. The process consists of constant reflection and application of core

values which build integrity. A person with integrity constantly takes time for reflection and daily analysis.

According to Palanski and Yammarino (2007), one way to address this problem is by considering integrity as a virtue (Audi & Murphy, 2006), which is defined simply as a discrete component of good character (Palanski and Yammarino, 2007). Such an approach draws upon long-established reasoning in the field of moral philosophy (Rachels, 2003) and provides a sound theoretical basis for establishing a distinct and, more importantly, usable conceptualization of integrity. Based on this consideration of integrity as a virtue, Palanski & Yammarino (2007) suggest that the domain of integrity is best defined as consistency of words and actions.

Furthermore, Palanski & Yammarino (2007, p.17) suggest that integrity should be defined as the “consistency of an acting entity's words and actions”. This definition is quite similar to Simons' (2002, p.19) definition of Behavioral Integrity as the “perceived pattern of alignment between an actor's words and deeds.”

Integrity at the individual level refers to the integrity of an individual person as an acting entity. More specifically, at the individual level integrity refers to the consistency of an individual's words and actions that is observable by relevant stakeholders (e.g., supervisor, peer, subordinate, or external customer). Simons' (2002) conceptualization of behavioral integrity includes two theoretical facets: congruence between stated and enacted values and between promises made and promises kept.

There is relevant research on integrity and leadership which can be directly translated into the correlation of integrity and coaching. Van Genderen (2014) stated in his research that out of the 62 countries, and 172 social scientists and management

scholars involved in the initial research, one of the major findings was that for every national culture, regardless of region, religion, etc. integrity was at the top of the list of the most important attributes of an effective leader.

Yukl (2002) proposes the following four personal values as being indicators of a leader's level of integrity: the extent to which a leader is honest and truthful, keeping promises and agreements, the extent to which a leader fulfills the responsibility of service and loyalty to followers; and lastly, the extent to which a leader can be trusted not to indiscriminately repeat something said in the utmost confidence (i.e., confidentiality).

1.4 Symbolic Interactionism and Roles Theory

In my rhetorical analysis of Mouratoglou as a coach I will examine the elements of trust, motivation and integrity and how coach Mouratoglou uses them by looking at specific examples from interactions with his players. In order to fully grasp how he manages to instill the three aspects into his coaching, and why those aspects are a major reason for his success as a coach, it is beneficial to look at a theory that helps shine light onto his actions.

The main theory that I will evaluate in this chapter is symbolic interactionism, and as a part of it, role theory. I believe that both theories will allow us to make greater sense of the concepts presented later on.

Symbolic interactionism is a micro-level theoretical framework and perspective in sociology that addresses how society is created and maintained through repeated interactions among individuals (Fuller, 2015). The perspective emerged in the mid-twentieth century from a variety of influences, including the Scottish Moralist and American Pragmatist philosophers—its greatest influence being American philosopher George Herbert Mead (1934) and his theories about the relationship between self and society. The emergence of symbolic interactionism was a response to the mainstream perspectives on society that dominated sociology at the time (Fuller, 2015).

Before symbolic interactionism came into play, dominant, positivist approaches tended to examine society from the ‘top down,’ focusing on the impact of macro-level institutions and social structures and how they impose on and constrain individuals. Departing from this tradition, symbolic interactionism was developed to understand the operation of society from the ‘bottom up,’ shifting the focus to micro-level processes that

emerge during face-to-face encounters in order to explain the operation of society (Fuller, 2015).

Central to the symbolic interactionist thought is the idea that individuals use language and significant symbols in their communication with others. Rather than addressing how common social institutions define and impact individuals, symbolic interactionists shift their attention to the interpretation of subjective viewpoints and how individuals make sense of their world from their unique perspective. Therefore, symbolic interactionists are often less concerned with objective structure than with subjective meaning—how repeated, meaningful interactions among individuals come to define the makeup of ‘society.

When I will evaluate Mouratoglou’s coaching strategies later on, it is crucial to look at his language and significant symbols in his communication with his athlete’s. These are what defines his relationship with them, what builds the foundation of trust, the emergence of motivation and what consolidates his integrity and in summary, what makes him a great coach.

Overall, the most important tenets of symbolic interactionism state that individuals act based on the meanings objects have for them. That being said, every interaction that takes place should be looked at within a particular social and cultural context where more than one person is involved. The situations that arise from people in this setting or context must be “defined or categorized” (Fuller, 2015) based on individual meanings. Therefore, interactions with other individuals and society as a whole is what produces meaning, and this meaning is continuously created and recreated through interpreting processes during those interactions (Blumer, 1969).

The main variant of symbolic interactionism was developed by Herbert Blumer (1969) at the University of Chicago in the 1950s. Blumer brought Mead's philosophically-based social behaviorism to sociology, even if some have seen his conception of symbolic interactionism more resembling WI Thomas's (1931) notion of the 'definition of the situation' than what is purely found in the work of Mead (Collins, 1994).

Blumer laid the foundation for a new theoretical paradigm which in many ways challenged sociology's accepted forms of epistemology and methodology. Considering that, Blumer's version of symbolic interactionism has been the most influential in sociology and most interactionist scholarship is aligned to some degree with his vision (Fuller, 2015).

Blumer emphasized how the self emerges from an interactive process of joint action (Denzin, 1992). Blumer, similar to Mead, saw individuals to be engaged in "mind action": humans do not generally ponder on themselves and their relationships to others. Rather, they constantly are engaged in mindful action where they manipulate symbols and negotiate the meaning of situations (Mead, 1934). Connected to that, Blumer believed that the study of human behavior must begin with human association, a notion that was not common in the viewpoint of early American sociology, which treated the individual and society as discrete entities (Meltzer and Petras, 1970).

Blumer's symbolic interactionism centers on processes actors use to constantly create and recreate experiences from one interaction to the next. For Blumer, symbolic interactionism was simply "the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings" (Blumer, 1962: 179). In his view, social institutions exist

only as individuals interact; society is not a structure but rather a continuing process where agency and indeterminateness of action is emphasized (Collins, 1994).

For Blumer, meanings are intersubjective and perceived, and constantly reinterpreted among individuals. There are no meanings inherent in the people or objects which an actor confronts – actors rather place meanings upon such entities which are perceived as unique (House, 1977). Blumer's theoretical contention was that human behavioral patterns must be studied in forms of action, and that human group life should be studied in terms of what the participants do together in units (Blumer, 1969).

Summed up, Blumer's theoretical orientation toward symbolic interactionism can be encapsulated through three premises (Blumer, 1969). Firstly, human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them; secondly, the meaning of things is derived from the social interaction that one has with others; and thirdly, meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by a person in dealing with the things they encounter (Blumer, 1969).

As a consequence of his theoretical orientation toward symbolic interactionism, Blumer was a constant critic of logical empiricism. For him, the idea that science was the one and only true vehicle for discovering truth was inherently flawed. For Blumer, any methodology for understanding social behavior must 'get inside' the individual in order to see the world as the individual perceives it. A sound methodologist must take it as given that patterns of behavior are not conducive for scientific insight as are other worldly phenomena because behavior takes place on the basis of an actor's own particular meanings.

Sociologist Sheldon Stryker believed that symbolic interactionist ideas could and should be tested using both qualitative and quantitative methods. According to Stryker, Mead's work can be conceived of as a 'frame' rather than a coherent theory with testable propositions (Stryker, 2008: 17). Therefore, Stryker expanded symbolic interactionist ideas through operationalizing variables that Mead presented as general assumptions and concepts by hypothesizing and empirically testing relationships among Mead's concepts while incorporating elements of role theory.

This brings us to the second part of this theoretical lens: role theories—which will aid in gaining better insight into Coach Mouratoglou's methods. Stryker further expanded Mead's concept of role taking in order to demonstrate the structural aspect of interaction. Within his work on roles he recognizes social roles as emerging from a reciprocal influence of networks or patterns of relationships in interactions as they are shaped by various levels of social structures. Stryker defines roles as "expectations which are attached to [social] positions" - or "-symbolic categories [that] serve to cue behavior" (Stryker, 1980: 57).

According to Stryker, expectations of roles vary across situations and within the context of cultural or social change. In taking the attitudes of others in a situation, an individual uses 'symbolic cues' built from prior experiences and normative expectations of status from social positions to assess potential lines of action. In this way, roles as they are attached to positions may be analyzed as predictors of future behavior for individuals in various social categories.

It is clear that symbolic interactionism and role theory are closely connected. As with symbolic interactionism, Stryker's structural role theory views socialization as the

process through which individuals learn normative expectations for actions as they relate to role relationships. In every situation, individuals identify themselves and others in the context of social structure. Individuals then apply what they perceive to be others' identifications of them. Then, over time, they become internalized expectations for behavior as part of the self. These internalized expectations, when accepted and enacted by individuals in various roles, become identities.

One of the most important symbolic interactionist theorists of the classical era was Erving Goffman, though some might hesitate to classify his work as representing purely an interactionist standpoint. Regardless, interactionist themes are found throughout Goffman's work: symbols, shared meaning, identity – all are common elements in his scholarship, which spanned multiple decades and influenced a legion of sociologists (Fuller, 2015). To this day, Goffman continues to be one of the most inspirational and cited sociologists.

Goffman's seminal book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) used the metaphor of a theatrical performance as a framework to describe how actors present themselves to others, and how they attempt to control others' impressions to be seen positively. Here Goffman documented the myriad strategies actors use in face-to-face interactions to manage impressions.

One relevant chapter of the book discusses role taking. Ralph Turner's (Turner, 1956) role theory emphasized role-making, or the process of creating and modifying definitions of oneself and one's roles as the orienting mechanism in interaction (Turner, 1962). He emphasized the dual nature of role relations, noting that role expectations must always be understood in relation to the counter-role in which they are juxtaposed (e.g.

one cannot understand the motivations or meanings of being a worker without understanding the corresponding role of manager).

Turner's role theory attempted to capture not only the ways in which individuals define role expectations themselves, but also how role expectations are embedded in the social structure. His theory pointed out that the self is as much a sociological entity as it is a psychological one. Turner's role theory was a formalized system, involving a series of axiomatic propositions that addressed how roles emerge in individuals and how they relate to society (Turner, 1968).

One of the roles that Goffman mentions in his book that stood out to me in connection to Mouratoglou, was the so-called 'training specialist.'. As already mentioned Goffman's book uses theatrical performance to present certain roles (that then can be translated to everyday life), the 'training specialist' being one of them. Individuals who take this role have the complicated task of teaching the performer how to build up a desirable impression while at the same time taking the part of the future audience and illustrating by punishing the consequences of improprieties (Goffman, 1956). Goffman explains that parents and schoolteachers are perhaps the basic examples of this role in our society. Mouratoglou as a coach also takes up this role.

In his career as a coach, Patrick was always aware of his role. Indeed, he developed necessary and useful skills in order to fulfill his role to the fullest. In chapter 4, I will analyze several video clips ranging from practices with elite pros to personal anecdotes shared by Mouratoglou himself. In these extractions, I hope to underline the communicative strategies used during his role as Coach as it relates to symbolic interactionism.

Chapter 2: Mouratoglou's Coaching Playbook–Analysis

In this chapter, I will do an in-depth analysis of Mouratoglou's coaching methodology through the lenses of trust, motivation, and integrity. To begin, Mouratoglou establishes a foundation of trust with each of his players. I will illustrate the rhetorical and nonverbal communicative strategies he uses to do so, by analyzing two different videos from his Youtube page. In the first video Patrick speaks with a young academy player regarding the topic of stress management. It is a candid encounter that shows us his communicative skills while tackling a tricky topic. Next, in the second video of Mouratoglou practicing with Serena Williams we can see his on-the-fly coaching strategy and how he technically adjusts his communicative methods to match this unique player.

Following the topic of trust as a foundation for coach and player relationships, I will analyze the way in which Mouratoglou employs motivation as a coaching mechanism. This section will be in reference to an anecdote found in the Netflix Documentary, "The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life" where Patrick works alongside a young and hopeful player—Irene Pavlovic. Here, Mouratoglou tackles the difficult issue of working with a player who is purposefully losing matches due to a lack of confidence. Here, I will examine how Coach Patrick utilizes autonomy-supportive behaviors to motive his player in unique ways to reap incredible results.

In the last section, I will analyze how Mouratoglou relies on integrity as a framework for his coaching. To do so, I will review two separate anecdotes from the Netflix Documentary, "The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life." Gathering information from the first video clip, I will discuss how the beginning of Patrick's partnership with the world's best female tennis player illustrates his commitment to integrity as viewed through the identity view of the integrity model. Utilizing this same theoretical lens, in

the second section I will touch on Coach Mouratoglou's first ever coaching failure: the demise of his relationship with Marcos Baghdatis and how this relates to integrity as a function in the Mouratoglou coaching playbook.

2.1 A Foundation of Trust

Trust is a key element in every social interaction which provides the foundation for effective relationships (Reina & Reina, 2006). For example, professional relationships prove more productive and less costly when trust is established (Lount, 2006). Considering this we can logically assume that a foundation of trust lays the groundwork for a successful relationship between athlete and coach.

In order for a player to take on the risks necessary to learn, develop, and change, the coach must cultivate a safe space through the development of trust. Only through trust can a player feel safe enough to reveal vulnerabilities, expose mistakes and deficiencies, and ultimately grow as an individual and athlete. Though researchers have largely emphasized the positive sides of trust, the lack of trust in the coaching relationship leads to various negative implications (Palmer, 2010). This is why any discussion regarding the effectiveness of a coaching relationship acknowledges the importance of trust.

Video Analysis I: Courtside Chat with an Academy Player

In the YouTube video “How to manage stress in match? | Tennis Mental Talk”, Coach Mouratoglou speaks with one of the players in his academy. As the caption of the video suggests, the two are discussing the young player’s inability to handle pressure in real matches versus practice situations (where he believes he competes on a higher level). Together, they work to establish methods through which the player can bridge this gap by playing more consistently during training as well as during the more intense, high-stakes moments.

The location is the Mouratoglou Academy. Sitting courtside on a bench, Patrick is seen wearing business casual clothes, whereas the young player (perhaps age 14-17) appears to have just finished practice. The camera angle and environment set the tone for this seemingly casual chat after practice. This informal setting allows Patrick to utilize multiple communicative techniques within this interaction. To illustrate Patrick’s ability to foster trust with his player, I will be focusing on the communicative skill of active, or empathetic listening. More specifically found in this video, methods of nonverbal mirroring, eye contact, and message paraphrasing will be analyzed.

To start, it is very interesting to see how Coach Mouratoglou opens the conversation: “I’ve just been told, like all the players, you’re going through moments where you kind of look for your way.” By using the inclusive phrase, “like all players,” he quickly establishes one of two major points. Firstly, Patrick is bringing the player comfort by letting him know he is not alone in his struggle and this is not a unique issue within the sport of tennis. And secondly, with the language of “look[ing] for your way,” Mouratoglou is able to reframe the player’s struggle into simply part of the player’s journey as an athlete.

Next, rather than assuming he knows how the player feels about the topic, Patrick opens up a dialogue, allowing the athlete to explain what exactly he is struggling with in his own words. It is easy to see the player become more relaxed as a level of intimacy is established. He appears to understand that Mouratoglou does not find the issue of stress management a negative problem, but rather an area for potential growth.

When analyzing Mouratoglou's body language, it is obvious that his rhetorical communication is enhanced through subtle nonverbal cues. Noticeably, he mirrors the way his player is sitting, crossing one leg over the other. While he does appear confident by sitting upright, he still manages to seem casual and laid back by laying his arm across the bench, opening up his body to the player. Continuing, Mouratoglou maintains other nonverbal cues of active listening through direct eye contact, silently nodding and smiling at times. All of these are important messages of confirmation and acknowledgement.

It is important to dive deeper into the subject of nonverbal communication in order to fully grasp Mouratoglou's methods. Indeed, many communication experts believe that most interpersonal communication is nonverbal. People's faces disclose emotions and telegraph what really matters to them (Santrock, 2001). Furthermore, a study by Dr. Albert Mehrabian at the University of California at Los Angeles found that the total impact of a message is based on 7 percent words used, 38 percent tone of voice, and 55 percent facial expressions, hand gestures, body position, and other forms of nonverbal communication (Goman, 2010). That being said, the first nonverbal cue I will focus on is the subtle way in which Mouratoglou mirrors the body language of the

athlete, to hopefully yield new insights into how utilizing nonverbal communicative methods can be overall effective in athlete–coach relationships.

Nonverbal mirroring refers to the unconscious mimicry of the postures, mannerisms, facial expressions, and other behaviors of one's interaction partner, for example, one's behavior passively and unintentionally changes to match that of others in one's current social environment (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). In fact, researchers have found a close association between nonverbal mirroring and rapport or trust. Charney (1966) proposed that nonverbal mirroring was the indicator of rapport or relatedness. Bernieri (1988) found a strong relationship between participants' rapport and the degree of nonverbal mirroring. Similarly, Bavelas, Black, Chovil, Lemery, and Mullett (1988) and Bavelas, Black, Lemery, and Mullett (1986) also proposed that the primary function of nonverbal mirroring was to show similarity and togetherness. This feeling of "togetherness" in a player coach relationship is one aspect that critically enhances the feeling of trust between both parties.

As I mentioned, Mouratoglou mirrors his conversation partner in various ways. The most obvious one having his right leg crossed over his left, while one arm grabs the upper leg, just the way the player across from him is sitting. Dr John Clabby, an expert in neurolinguistic, mentions a very interesting aspect about physical/nonverbal mirroring. He explains that there is a significant difference between mirroring and imitating one's body language. While imitating might even decrease the level of trust and rapport, correct physical mirroring can have a huge positive impact on developing trust (Mullett, 1986).

Therefore, Clabby illustrates how in response to a person who crosses his/her left leg over the right, the imitator will duplicate the patient's movement by crossing his/her

left leg over his/her right. However, when correctly practicing physical mirroring, one should do the opposite by crossing the right leg over the left, as if the conversation partner was looking in a mirror. This indicates that a key aspect of physical mirroring is to be subtle and inexact since being obvious may decrease rapport. Therefore, correct physical mirroring should also lag behind the person by a few seconds to several minutes (Mullet, 1986).

In the video, Mouratoglou has his legs crossed exactly in the way Dr Clabby describes as real physical mirroring. Further into the video, at minute 11:47 to be exact, there is a cut in the video production. Now, both coach and player sit with the other leg crossed over. This means that Mouratoglou adapted the way he crossed his legs in order to correctly mirror his player's body language. This indicates that Mouratoglou is highly aware of the technique of physical mirroring.

The next nonverbal clue that Mouratoglou noticeably pays attention to, is keeping direct eye contact to his player. In a presentation by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC"), nonverbal communication serves as a two-way mirror: not only does it allow the mediator to manipulate his or her body language to be perceived favorably by the opposite party, but it serves as a mechanism to interpret the opinions of the party that may not be voiced (Taylor, 2018). Thus, not only is maintaining eye contact with a party important to develop chemistry and trust, it can allow the mediator to determine the mood of the party and alter his or her mediation strategy accordingly.

Continuing, Ergin and Birol (2005) indicate that the real communication between two persons begins when two of the persons establish eye contact; so, eye contact has an important role and meaning in communication. If a person looks you in the eye (builds

eye contact with you), it can be interpreted as that person cares for you or is interested in you. However, when a person avoids eye contact, it is often seen as hiding something or lack of confidence (Ergin, A., & Birol, C., (2005).

The relationship between a player and a coach can be directly compared to the relationship between a student and a teacher. In a related study, the use of eyes, mimicry and gestures were shown to help establish rapport and trust, whereas teachers who failed to look students in the eye seem to lack confidence and provoke a sense of insecurity amongst students (Gower and Walters, 1983). Adding to this, Pollitt (2006) indicates that eye contact is critical in the teacher-student relationship as teachers who fail to look their students in the eye when speaking to them may appear to show a lack of confidence in themselves, which could lead to potential problems with discipline.

Similarly, Ledbury et al. (2004) suggest that teachers watch learners as well as listen to them, particularly while they are performing tasks to look for signs of being bored or being lost. The same method should be utilized by coaches with their players. Thus, eye contact is not only considered to be a tool for a teacher to convey messages but also as a means to interpret the messages students display nonverbally via their eyes, mimicry and gestures. This means that Mouratoglou does not only keep eye contact in order to portray himself as confident and trustworthy, he also pays close attention to his players' emotions, which is an aspect of building trust that I will evaluate further on in this chapter.

The ongoing eye contact might also be an indicator for why the player opens up about his struggles with such ease. Research shows that there is a strong link between the amount of eye contact people receive and their degree of participation in communication.

Indeed, Parker (2006) indicates “by maintaining eye contact with students when speaking or listening to them, the teacher (or in our case the coach) is asserting that he or she expects conversation and is interested in what the student (player) is saying”; in other words, it encourages participation.

Students also reported that eye contact makes them feel important and confident which is in line with the view of Ergin and Birol (2005) that if a person looks you in the eye, it can be interpreted as that person cares for you or is interested in you which makes you feel important. In conclusion, this illustrates that by maintaining eye contact with his player, Mouratoglou effectively builds a foundation of trust, inviting his player to open up to his coach and incite feelings of confidence and value.

Jumping back to the video conversation, the player says, “I think the main issue is that I tend to feel better during practices. I tend to doubt myself more during matches. I think the stress of the match comes because of focusing more on the result. Like, I have to win this match in order to achieve this goal. It’s all about the consequences, rather than in practice—here whatever happens, happens.” To which Mouratoglou replies: “So it’s about expectations that you have in the match, and you don’t have these expectations in practice. You’re here to practice, if you miss, you miss. There is no consequence. In a match you feel that there are consequences, right?”

In this simple back and forth dialogue, Mouratoglou’s ability to utilize paraphrasing is on display. Without interruptions, Patrick lets his player talk for as long as he appears comfortable to. He then repeats back what the player said, illustrating his capability of receiving the athlete's overall message and rephrasing that message in his own words while maintaining an emotional context.

Weger Jr., Castle and Emmett (2010) underline that paraphrasing is a verbal analogue to nonverbal mimicry. In their study, listeners who paraphrase a speaker's message and thus communicate interest in it were found to be overall more likable by interviewees. The perceived tacit endorsement of the speaker's message is thought to create a greater sense of closeness or immediacy between the interviewer and the interviewee (Trenhol & Jensen, 2004).

Using the latter tools of mirroring, eye contact, and rephrasing, Mouratoglou is able to foster a feeling of empathy for his players, which as mentioned earlier, is a significant aspect necessary in building trust. Next, Patrick's sense of sensitivity while conversing with his player can be seen in two examples: the introduction of metaphors and inclusive language.

First, he briefly touches on some peoples' fear of flying or driving. Because they are out of control, they may have fear that they will crash. Mouratoglou states, "It's the exact same thing in a match. You don't have the wheel. You have the wheel on some things, but not the results." With this metaphor, Mouratoglou again demonstrates understanding and compassion as well as gives his player an abstract visualization to work with.

After the athlete names the challenges he is facing during competition, we see Mouratoglou makes the player feel like his challenges are also the coach's challenges. When offering a way to better the problem, Patrick says, "We must find a way so that you focus, and what makes you happy or not happy depends only on you." Utilizing inclusive language through "we" statements eliminates the divide between coach and player, creating the sense of a team.

All of these rhetorical and nonverbal communication methods create a sense of trust between the player and the coach, which leads to an open conversation where the player seemingly gains value. What stands out is Patrick's ability to actively listen to the player. While he gives the player the chance to freely voice his opinion, he acknowledges his thoughts and words through body language and nonverbal cues. Afterwards, he repeats what the athlete already stated in his own words, demonstrating that he can empathize with the player's issues. Through all this, a layer of trust is built, which allows him to use abstract examples and metaphors to offer solutions that seem to resonate with the young player.

Finally, looking at Mouratoglou's capability of laying a foundation of trust in the player-coach relationship from the theoretical lens of symbolic interactionism, a couple of things are evident. First of all, the latter conversation is a perfect example of why symbolic interactionism exists. Human interaction or a conversation between at least two people is necessary to examine symbolic interactionism, since symbolic interactionism focuses on micro-level processes that emerge during face-to-face encounters (Fuller, 2015). Considering that, the theory is of great use in this in-depth-one-on-one talk between player and coach.

This is especially the case as symbolic interactionists shift their attention to the interpretation of subjective viewpoints and how individuals make sense of their world from their unique perspective. In this particular example, both player and coach are seeing eye to eye on most points, and it becomes evident that they share many common values as they are both experts within the field of tennis. Nevertheless, while seeing eye to eye, both player and coach still have their own viewpoints and perspectives. They are

able to express them and find common ground based on their different experiences. Thus, trust is formed through symbolic interactionism.

Mouratoglou's role as a coach depends on the relationship he forms with his player. Stryker defines roles as "expectations which are attached to [social] positions" - or "-symbolic categories [that] serve to cue behavior" (Stryker, 1980, p. 57). In our case, all the expectations which are attached to the social position of the coach are fulfilled in Mouratoglou's conversation between him and his player. He actively listens, he gives meaningful advice, and as a result of that, he is able to establish trust—the most critical foundation to any successful player-coach relationship.

Video Analysis II: Practice Session with the World's Greatest

The next video that I will analyze is "Serena Williams' Practice at the Mouratoglou Academy" found on Coach Patrick's Youtube page. For some context, this

training session took place in the Spring of 2021 during her preparation for Roland Garros, the second Grand Slam of the year. In the 8 minute, 38 second video, Patrick stands behind Serena, giving her in-the-moment instruction while she hits balls to two unnamed individuals across the net. A few bystanders can be seen on both sides of the court watching the practice.

Contrasting the first video, Patrick makes subtle, but important shifts in the way he interacts with Serena. It is obvious this is due to the different setting and the nature of the player. Here he is working on the court with the most decorated female tennis player of all time, so the approach must vary. Here, the main mechanisms of communication that stand out most are Mouratoglou's use of his voice intonation, speed and volume.

To start, Mouratoglou gives Serena a combination of both technical advice and brief encouragement. He does not get too complicated, keeping each comment short. For example, he says, "Remember, prepare first, then move—especially up." Followed by, "Bien" or "fantastic." When Serena makes the technical adjustment, he notes it stating: "way to move up." Again, being in conversation with one of the most coached players in the sport, Patrick seems to understand it is not what you say, but how you say it. None of the actual instruction is anything Serena has not heard before—in fact, she has probably heard it thousands of times. Patrick seemingly accounts for this fact and delivers the short messages with a quick, yet calm tone of voice.

Research shows that rapport can be established through nonverbal communication and appropriate tone and voice (Santrock, 2001). Coach Mouratoglou continues this tone of voice throughout the session, alongside his interesting use of volume. Patrick never

raises his voice beyond a conversational level. In fact, after each play finishes he casually walks closer to her, almost whispering at times. He is not loud or over the top.

Pearce and Brommel (1971) note that conversational speech that is characterized in part by less volume tended to be rated as more trustworthy than more dynamic delivery of speech. By using conversational speech and volume Mouratoglou is able to accomplish two things. Firstly, Serena is forced to listen more carefully to what he is actually saying. Secondly, he builds rapport by creating the illusion of a one-on-one experience. Anyone can acknowledge the mental toll that being constantly watched and recorded can have on a player. Knowing the attention she attracts, I believe Coach Patrick actively works to create an environment where Serena can shut out unnecessary distraction. This allows her to relax and focus on her playing. Again, this illustrates Mouratoglou's high level of respect and empathy toward his players.

Researchers have found that chemistry may be established with "the gaze or tone of voice or other less tangible factors" to establish trust (Santrock, 2001). Mouratoglou's overall communicative methodology creates more intimacy between the two, which in return strengthens the element of trust in their relationship.

Overall, the video presents how Mouratoglou is able to utilize simple verbal and nonverbal methods of communication that ultimately strengthen the bond of trust between him and the best female tennis player in the world. Particularly, his tone of voice, the volume in which he speaks, and the clarity in which he presents his ideas are what makes Serena trust her coach's instinct. There are no revolutionary ideas that he brings forward, but his presence and the environment that guarantees Serena a complete

focus on herself as an athlete is what creates the chemistry between player and coach that can be viewed in the video.

From a theoretical standpoint, what stands out from my perspective is that Mouratoglou is perfectly aware of the role that he is taking when working with Serena. The dynamic is different compared to the first video of the section, where he played a more dominant and authoritative role.

When coaching Serena, this is not quite the case. The reasons lay at hand: Serena is the most decorated female tennis player of all time, Mouratoglou won't explain tennis to her. More so, he has to show a great sense of sensitivity when working with her. Connected to that, his tone of voice is more intimate and quiet; a loud and commanding voice would certainly not fit the role he plays in this player-coach dynamic.

2.2 Motivation as a Mechanism

Locke and Latham (1985) explained that an individual's level of success in athletic competition is primarily dependent upon skill and motivation. Therefore, a primary responsibility of coaches is to motivate their athletes to perform at optimal levels. Sage indicated motivation is the direction and intensity of an individual's effort.

Adding to this, in a clip found on his Youtube page, Coach Mouratoglou is found stating: "Don't listen to what they say, hear what they think" (Mouratoglou, 2021).

Patrick notes that in order to motivate your player it is critical that you understand what your player is thinking. There are many reasons people in today's society do not always say what they think – pressure to have it “all together”, - to appear strong or not look weak. In the latter video, Mouratoglou gives the example of a player who might appear confident in practice but in a high-stakes match, that confidence can collapse like a stack of cards. It is in situations like these that a coach must be able to read between the lines, so to speak. Only by doing this, is it possible to know how to motivate each athlete in a way that best suits them as an individual player.

In this section, I will evaluate how Patrick Mouratoglou is able to motivate his players, even if they seem to show signs of low internal motivation. In order to do so, I will look at part of the Netflix Documentary, *The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life*, where Patrick shares an anecdote regarding Irena Pavlovic—a young, up and coming French player. Presented in his own words, I believe this section gives great insight into how Mouratoglou is able to uniquely deploy the tool of motivation with his players.

Video Analysis: Irena Pavlovic, When a Player Tanks

In the Netflix series “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life,” Mouratoglou explains that the first qualities he looks at in a player are his/her ambition, which basically can be seen as a synonym for motivation and connected to that, self-belief. Considering that, Mouratoglou does not listen to what the player says at first, because according to him everybody says that they “want to be number one in the world.” Instead, he tries to “hear what the player thinks,” which basically means that he wants to understand if the player really believes in themselves, and if their internal motivation matches their ambition. To illustrate how Coach Mouratoglou is able to unlock a player’s self-determination and extrinsic motivation, I will analyze the use of autonomy-supportive behaviors in an encounter between him and 15-year-old Irena Pavlovic.

In the case of Irena Pavlovic, Mouratoglou explains that she was a very talented athlete, who was struggling after some losses early on in their partnership. Irena would play her matches and it looked like she was not trying to win. Worse than that, it looked like she was “tanking” the match. Tanking is when a player purposefully misses balls and loses points in an effort to throw away the match quickly. Tanking is not necessarily a common thing that happens, but some players can be seen doing it in desperate moments.

In “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life,” Mouratoglou states that usually tanking and giving away matches happens more to players who are very talented and skillful. According to the coach, the reason behind that is actually insecurity, as these kinds of players would rather lose a match than having someone take away their label of being “talented.” This is a very important point, as it shows how the coach tries to get to

the root of the problem in order to solve it. He wants and needs to understand his player and feel what he or she is going through. Only then will he be able to help them gain back that missing motivation that prevents players from trying.

Mouratoglou goes on to say that his instinctive reaction would have been to tell Irena that “not trying” is unacceptable, as he and her whole team “work really hard to make her a better player”. He even calls her behavior “disrespectful”. But the coach is aware that involving too many emotions would only add more tension to the athlete and to their relationship, which would not serve as a motivating, benefitting factor.

This means that he must find a different approach. As already mentioned, first he wants to get to the cause of the problem. “My player is tanking? I need to know why.” After he knows what causes this negative spiral and decrease of motivation, the second question that he asks himself is “What is the best thing we can do to make you stop tanking?”.

The coach decides to take an unconventional approach. After she gave away another match, they sat down afterwards to talk about the match. Instead of putting her down when she is already at her lowest, Mouratoglou told her that “it was all his fault.” Irena did not expect this from her coach at all, she actually thought that Mouratoglou would “kill her.” But by taking the blame and the responsibility, Mouratoglou achieved something way bigger than by criticizing her.

After that talk, Irena realized that she and Mouratoglou sit in the same boat. He is willing to take the blame for a loss, even though she was the one tanking the match. This strategy served as a great motivation in the future, as she realized that it was up to her to

take responsibility and fight not only for herself, but also for her coach and her whole team.

In the show, Mouratoglou explains: “When I said this to her, she thought: ‘Wow, he wants me to do better; he’s 100% with me. I can’t disappoint this guy.’” After that, Irena would never tank a match ever again.

Furthermore, this approach of taking all the blame on himself resulted in a shift in Irena’s mindset. Obviously, Irena is aware that Mouratoglou is not the one who is responsible for throwing away the match. In a way, by Mouratoglou stating that it is his fault, Irena finally realizes that her behavior might be selfish toward the people around her. It makes her realize that it is up to her to take responsibility. Therefore, Mouratoglou is able to evoke a sense of autonomy within his player that she did not have before. Ironically, he initially had to take her autonomy away from her by blaming himself.

In their motivational model of the coach-athlete relationship, Mageau & Vallerand note several critical aspects of autonomy-supportive behaviors. The four that I find clearly in this interaction between Mouratoglou and Irena are 1) providing rationale for tasks and limits, 2) avoiding controlling behaviors such as criticisms, controlling statements and tangible rewards for interesting tasks, 3) acknowledging the athlete’s feelings and perspectives, and 4) providing opportunity for athletes to show initiative and act independently (2003).

In the latter interaction, the first autonomy-supportive behavior Coach Mouratoglou engages in is providing a rationale for why Irena was limiting herself. After asking her what happened and waiting for her to explain, he responds: “It’s 100 percent my fault. I’m sorry.” By making himself the reason for her failure, Patrick provides Irena

with a rationale for her tanking. Though there may not be much truth to this fact, nonetheless, he is able to create a sense of togetherness rather than isolation by taking the blame.

Following, we can see how Coach Mouratoglou avoids the controlling behavior of criticism by withholding his feelings of frustration with Irena. As Patrick tells this story, we know how he actually feels about her self-destructive behavior. He tells the audience, Irena's decision to not try during the match was "unacceptable" and "disrespectful", but he chooses to withhold this from her. Instead, Coach Patrick looks inward to ask himself the question of why his player is tanking. After he finds his answer, he takes the interaction in a different direction. By choosing sympathy, rather than criticism he maintains his composure as her coach. This leads us into the next autonomy supportive behavior shown by Mouratoglou.

Patrick is attuned to Irena's feelings in the moment, a critical autonomy-supportive behavior (Deci, Egharari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994). He recognizes Irena is behaving from a fear-based response. She does not need to be talked down to; she needs to feel supported. Patrick's sensitivity to her emotions can be seen in several nonverbal cues as well. He physically gets down on her level to speak with her and smiles because he knows she is in a fragile state. To illustrate his understanding of Irena's feelings he goes on to say:

She was very sensitive, emotional. So I knew that the right way was to be very human with her. Show her love and respect, and that I wanted to help her. We were together, and because we were a team, the last thing I would do is to blame her.

Lastly, Mouratoglou utilizes the autonomy-supportive behavior of providing opportunity for the athlete to show initiative and act independently. By reframing the negative situation more positively, Patrick is able to pull Irena into the decision-making process. He is offering her a meaningful choice—continue on tanking, or take the initiative to give her all in the matches from here on out. And, as we learn from the Netflix documentary, Irena never tanked another match in her career.

Overall, research shows that autonomy-supportive interpersonal behaviors play an important role in dyadic interactions; this can especially be seen in relationships between supervisors and subordinates (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Specifically, when supervisors support their subordinates' need for autonomy, they ultimately help their subordinates meet their needs, and therefore increase self-determined motivation (Pelletier et al., 2002). These findings have implications for sports, as the coach/athlete relationship holds a similar structure. Thus, it can be suggested that the coaches' interpersonal behaviors can have important implications on athlete motivation (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2011).

A coach's ability to present these behaviors can in return nurture athletes' intrinsic motivation and self-determined types of extrinsic motivation (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). In the latter interaction with player Irena Pavlovic, Coach Mouratoglou's autonomy-supportive behaviors certainly result in his player having self-determined, or extrinsic motivation overall. In this video analysis, we can see Patrick's ability to 1) provide a rationale for Irena's limits, 2) avoid the controlling behavior of criticism, and rather respond by 3) acknowledging her feelings and perspective, which in return

provided the ultimate opportunity for Irena to 4) independently choose to better her game play.

Furthermore, from a theoretical point of view, symbolic interactionism plays a critical part in Mouratoglou's approach of motivating Irena. Therefore, Blumer's theoretical orientation shines light on why this is the case.

Blumer states that firstly, human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them; secondly, the meaning of things is derived from the social interaction that one has with others; and thirdly, meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by a person in dealing with the things they encounter (Blumer, 1969).

Mouratoglou's actions could have been very different if it were not for the 'meanings' he saw in his coach-player relationship with Irena. Instead of criticizing and blaming her, the coach presented his high level of emotional intelligence and his awareness of what will ultimately benefit Irena as an athlete - which presented the ultimate 'meaning' (next to his relationship with Irena and her overall well-being) that encapsulated Mouratoglou's actions.

In addition to that, for Blumer, any methodology for understanding social behavior must 'get inside' the individual in order to see the world as the individual perceives it. In the Netflix documentary, Mouratoglou explains how he needs to get to know his players thoughts in order to fully grasp how he can help the player. "My player is tanking? I need to know why." As mentioned in the introduction, one of Mouratoglou's greatest skills he developed in his childhood: the ability to read people. The ways of

solving the issues Irena had are closely tied to this ability, an ability that represents a great example of symbolic interactionism—which ultimately lead to helping his player.

2.3 The Functionality of Integrity

A central role in the Mouratoglou coaching playbook deals with the concept of integrity. However, as evident in the literature review, it is difficult to conceptualize what integrity is, let alone how to operationalize, measure, and test it. With this being said, I prefer to align with Kingley's (2005) understanding of integrity: that it comes from reliable promises, sharing of valid information, and expressions of honesty. Continuing, it is marked by values like openness, sense of deep commitment, self expression, honesty, respect, reliability, discipline, and personal responsibility. Integrity in the role of coach is an undeniable element to success (Markovic, 2014).

Taking into account Kingley's understanding of integrity, I will use the identity view of integrity to analyze two separate anecdotes found in the Netflix documentary "The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life." Bernard Williams' identity view of integrity frames integrity as an endorsement of the commitments people identify with most deeply, otherwise known as "identity-conferring commitments."

According to The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2021), these "identity-conferring commitments" cover many different kinds of intentions, promises, convictions and relationships of trust and expectation. Continuing, one can be "committed in different ways to many different kinds of thing: people, institutions, traditions, causes, ideals, principles, projects, and so on; they can be explicitly, self-consciously, publicly entered into or implicit, unself-conscious and private" (Cox et al., 2021). However, this view of integrity is not simply a matter of staying true to one's general commitments, but rather focuses on the specific kinds of commitments that are centrally important to a person's integrity (Cox et al., 2021).

With this framework in mind, I find Coach Mouratoglou's deepest convictions (as they relate to his coaching style) to be: honest feedback, respect for one another, and results on the court. These three identity-conferring commitments are on display in the following anecdotes. Firstly, Mouratoglou discusses the origin of his partnership with Serena Williams. In the second clip, Patrick shares his biggest coaching regret as it relates to his former player Marcos Baghdatis.

Video Analysis I: Serena Williams, Partnership Origin Story

To begin, Coach Mouratoglou shares how he got the chance to work with Serena Williams in “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life.” As Patrick mentions, he always imagined and visualized how he would end up coaching Serena one day. In the documentary he even states that if he could have chosen one player that he could coach, it would have been Serena Williams.

In 2012, Serena hit a rough patch with several injuries which led to a lack of confidence in her game. Considering that, she went through a couple of bad losses, the worst one being the first round exit at the French Open—the first time Serena had ever lost in the first round of a Grand Slam tournament. After the shocking loss, Serena decided to stay in France to practice for a few more days—so she sent a text to Coach Patrick asking if she could train at his facilities.

Obviously, Mouratoglou welcomed her at his academy and was able to have a conversation with her for the first time ever. In this conversation, Serena told the coach that she wanted to get back to being the number one player in the world, and she asked him what he thought of her game and what he thinks she should do. In this player-coach encounter we find Patrick’s first driving commitment of honest feedback on display.

After Serena’s question, according to Mouratoglou, his thoughts were: “This is your one chance to train the greatest player in the history of our sport, you have to be perfect.” With this amount of pressure, the easiest way to answer Serena’s question would be to tell her what she already knows and what everyone always tells her—that she is the greatest, that she just has to work hard and eventually she will be at the top again. But Mouratoglou chose a different route.

That being said, Mouratoglou told Serena in their first meeting at his academy that she is an “underachiever” (even though she already won 13 Grand Slams up to that point). He also added that he saw her come to tournaments unprepared many times, and that he feels like she does not have a “Plan B” when things do not go her way on the court. In his opinion, she loses way too many matches.

Knowing Serena’s strong personality, she could have taken this the wrong way and become upset about Patrick’s words. Nevertheless, the coach states in the Netflix documentary that he did not feel nervous at all, he knew deep down that he expressed his honest opinion, and that he said what he felt was right and the truth. As a matter of fact, Serena was so impressed by commitment to honest feedback, that immediately following that conversation they began their partnership which would go on to flourish for many years.

Even though Mouratoglou was not Serena’s coach when they had this first encounter, this conversation cuts close to one of Patrick’s rules from The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life. In the documentary, the coach states “a coach should never be afraid to get fired.” This rule is grounded heavily in his commitments and how they relate to integrity. According to this rule, a coach should express his thoughts in an honest and truthful way. Of course, good coaches are able to still show compassion and empathy toward the player while doing so (later on in the Netflix episode Mouratoglou notes there is “never a reason to let emotions destroy a relationship”), but good coaches have to take into account that they might upset their player and as a result, maybe even get fired. Mouratoglou states: “If you’re afraid to get fired, you will always tell the player what she

wants to hear.” In the end, that would be a betrayal of his first identity-conferring commitment of honest feedback.

Another great example from the documentary that underlines Mouratoglou’s integrity as it relates to the maintenance of his commitment to respect can be seen in an encounter between him and Serena during Wimbledon 2012. In “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life,” Mouratoglou states that Serena likes “to test people,” and at their first practice in Wimbledon, she was testing him.

Serena arrived late to the practice, and entered the court without looking at her coach, even after he said “Good morning”. Throughout the practice, she continued to withhold eye contact with Mouratoglou, nor reply to any of his coaching advice. Again, most people that work with Serena Williams and face a situation like that, would probably get intimidated and afraid. They would try to speak with extra caution to her in order to somehow get through and start a conversation.

Instead of doing so, Mouratoglou chose a different way of operating. At the first water break, he went in front of Serena and slapped her on her cap. Mouratoglou recalls in the show that Serena reacted surprised and irritated, because “no one ever did that to her.” But for the first time in that practice, he “got her attention”.

After that, Mouratoglou went on to tell Serena that there are rules that she has to follow when working with him. The first rule being that he expects her to say good morning and to look at him when she enters the court. For the second rule, he explains to her, “When I talk to you, you listen to me and you look at me and reply.”

In this case, Mouratoglou reacted in a direct, honest and in some way strict manner towards Serena. It is important to note that while doing so, he never let his

emotions get the better of him. He did not get personal or overly upset, but he kept his language clear, concise and direct. Once again, he was not afraid to get fired, however, his strong conviction of respect was not to be played with.

Ultimately this earned him Serena's respect, which was lacking prior to this incident. By bringing his core commitments of honest feedback as well as respect within the partnership with his player, he was able to achieve his ultimate identity-conferring commitment of results. Every action and reaction for Mouratoglou has this third commitment in mind. You can have commitments of honesty and respect within your player-coach relationship, but the ultimate goal is that this partnership produces results on and off the court. With this being said, the ten-year long partnership between Williams and Coach Mouratoglou would certainly go on to do just that.

Video Analysis II: Marcos Baghdatis

When a coach is in tune with their deepest commitments and convictions like the former example, a partnership can flourish. However, Cox et al. (2021) reminds us that “people may, through ignorance or self-deception, fail to understand or properly acknowledge the source of their deepest commitments and convictions” and in doing so “fail to act on their core commitments, through self-deception, weakness of will, cowardice, or even ignorance.”

In “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life,” Mouratoglou describes his failed partnership with first prodigy player, Cypriot Marcos Baghdatis. In hindsight, Patrick shares that he did not have enough experience at the time and this led to complications. Reading between the lines, we can infer that in the early days Coach Mouratoglou’s three identity-conferring commitments of honesty, respect, and results had not yet become fully-formed.

Patrick tells us that he and Marcos shared a very close and productive player-coach relationship. Not only was Baghdatis highly successful from a very young age on, Mouratoglou even goes so far to state that he considers him as a “son.” After Baghdatis’ early success, he told Mouratoglou that “now he knows what it takes to get to the top,” indicating that he does not have to put in as much work as before. Mouratoglou disagreed heavily with this statement. In fact, he told Baghdatis exactly that, underlining that he was not afraid to voice his opinion even in the early stages of his coaching career. Again, here we see the identity-conferring commitment of honesty in full play.

Nevertheless, a gap in communication between the duo was evident. Patrick wanted to push Baghdatis towards his ultimate commitment of results, but Marcos

wanted to sail by, putting in less effort now that he had reached the so-called “big stage.” Mouratoglou admits this led to some unhealthy exchanges between the two, as Coach Patrick was emotionally-fueled by Marcos’ lack of respect for his coach as well as himself. Patrick told Baghdatis that he was “embarrassing him with his attitude”, a statement that did not sit well with Baghdatis. Ultimately, this lack of compassion while attempting to achieve their shared goals together was what caused the two to go separate ways.

Mouratoglou notes that to this day, he regrets his words and he was not a good coach at that time because he let emotions get in the way of him maintaining his identity-conferring commitment to integrity. He was able to be honest with his player and showed his commitment to getting results on the court, but as Cox et al. notes, failing to “recognize the relevance of self-knowledge in order to act with integrity, is a failure to harness one’s identity-conferring commitments.”

That being said, although this anecdote is about Mouratoglou’s failure as a coach in the past, we can see from the first analysis that Patrick was able to learn from this player-coach relationship. We can gather that Coach Mouratoglou understands that integrity is not simply a characteristic, but a skill to be learned and put into actions in order to achieve his commitments of honesty, respect, and results.

Symbolic interactionists are often less concerned with objective structure than with subjective meaning—how repeated, meaningful interactions among individuals come to define the makeup of society. Integrity is one part that makes face-to-face interactions meaningful. Integrity can simply be defined as a discrete component of good character (Palanski and Yammarino, 2007). However, using the identity view of integrity, we see

how Patrick's ability to maintain his commitments of honesty, respect, and results with his players, underlines how trust and integrity (and also motivation) go hand in hand with one another.

Again, this form of integrity is also a form of symbolic interactionism which makes him earn the respect of his athletes. In his book "The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life", as the title suggests, Goffman evaluates the impression people make through their daily actions. Connected to integrity, Kingley proposed a process named 'integrity mapping' for maintaining and developing integrity. The process consists of constant reflection and application of core values which build integrity. A person with integrity constantly takes time for reflection and daily analysis. This daily work in order to strengthen one's own core values combined with Goffman's awareness of how people try to present themselves are a form of symbolic interactionism that can be seen in Mouratoglou's daily coaching methods as well.

Integrity at the individual level refers to the integrity of an individual person as an acting entity. More specifically, at the individual level integrity refers to the consistency of an individual's words and actions that is observable by relevant stakeholders (Simons, 2002). This consistency at the "micro-level" (Fuller, 2015) of face-to-face encounters between two people is a great example of symbolic interactionism.

Played out through his words and actions, Coach Patrick is able to harness honesty, respect, and results within his player-coach encounters. Mouratoglou is aware that his role as a great coach relies on his deep sense of his identity-conferring commitments, and his utilization of integrity, alongside a foundation of trust and mechanisms of motivation is what makes him the most extraordinary coach in the game.

Chapter 3: Conclusion

In this thesis I have discussed the reasons why Patrick Mouratoglou is so successful as a tennis coach. In doing so, I presented Mouratoglou's past and highlighted several events that shaped him into the person and coach that he is today. Considering this, a noteworthy element of Coach Mouratoglou's past is his shift from a quiet, shy child to the dynamic and confident extrovert the world has come to know. Even at a young age, Patrick was molding weaknesses, (such as his childhood social anxiety) into strengths (like the ability to read people and anticipate their thoughts, needs, and desires). Already from the beginning of his journey, Mouratoglou was showing his adaptability at any given challenge—a true marker of an excellent coach.

Moving past Mouratoglou's early years, I evaluated specific examples of Coach Patrick working alongside a vast spectrum of tennis players. In the analysis section, I highlighted Mouratoglou's ability to lay a foundation of trust between himself and his players. Utilizing tools of empathetic listening, such as nonverbal mirroring, eye contact, and message paraphrasing Patrick shows his ability to intimately connect with his players. These nonverbal cues work well alongside rhetorical strategies like communicative tools such as voice intonation, speed and volume, which Mouratoglou tailors specifically to each unique player.

Additionally, I looked at how Mouratoglou uses motivation as a mechanism to gain high-level results from his players. Patrick is uniquely empathetic to his players, as seen through his use of autonomy-supportive behaviors, such as providing rationale for tasks and limits, avoiding controlling behaviors such as criticism, acknowledging the athlete's feelings and perspectives, and providing opportunity for athletes to show initiative and act independently.

Lastly, I evaluated how integrity plays a major part in his role as a coach. Mouratoglou shares two personal anecdotes in the Netflix documentary, “The Playbook: A Coach’s Rules for Life” which I analyze through the lens of the “identity view of integrity,” which best describes integrity as maintained through identity-conferring commitments. For Patrick these commitments, or coaching convictions, include honest feedback, respect for the player-coach dynamic, and results (on and off the court).

In chapter 4.1, the video analysis section that is connected to the aspect of ‘trust,’ Mouratoglou is having a one-on-one talk with a young male player. The overall topic of their talk is how to better manage the stress of a tennis match. I evaluated that through several forms of symbolic interactionism, Mouratoglou is able to build a foundation of trust and fulfill his role as a coach. Specifically his non-verbal cues (e.g. body language, eye contact, mirroring etc.) are what stands out from this talk and benefit him greatly in creating a level of trust that is crucial in a successful player-coach relationship.

In the second video analysis of chapter 4.1, I take a practice video of Mouratoglou and Serena Williams under scope. Here, the most significant takeaway for me was how he is able to build trust and intimacy by lowering the tone of his voice, and by changing some aspects of his overall appearance compared to the first video. Indeed, he presents himself in a much more calm, reserved manner—which creates a personal atmosphere that fosters trust between player and coach. The role of the dominant, confident coach from the previous video switches. He still presents himself in a confident manner, but his role is not authoritarian at all—exactly the role he needs to portray in order to connect with an athlete like Serena Williams.

In chapter 4.2, I analyze how Mouratoglou utilizes motivation as a mechanism. In the video clip, Mouratoglou is able to optimize results from his high emotional intelligence. His compassion and use of autonomy-supportive behaviors unlocks missing motivation within his player Irena Pavlovic. Fulfilling his role as a great coach, Mouratoglou is aware of the mental struggles that his player has to face. His high level of empathy brings out a new form of responsibility within his player that was not there before, and as a consequence boosts her motivation during a lowpoint. It is important to note that the successful ways of motivating his player in the video come from the foundation of trust that already exists.

Chapter 4.3 is the last chapter of the analysis part of this thesis. Here, I talk about Mouratoglou's high level of integrity, and how Bernard William's "identity-conferring commitments" play a central role in evaluating Mouratoglou's interactions with his athletes. I identified honest feedback, respect for one another, and results on the court as the identity-conferring commitments that make up Mouratoglou's understanding of integrity as a coach.

In this paper, I argue that trust, motivation and integrity are Mouratoglou's key coaching components. By doing so, I pointed out that symbolic interactionism as a theoretical lens helps gaining a better understanding of why he is able to successfully convey his messages towards his players. Therefore, Coach Patrick integrates specific verbal and nonverbal cues into his coaching, which ultimately define his relationship to his athletes.

Furthermore, role theory serves as a baseline of understanding to grasp Mouratoglou's role as a great coach. I incorporated role theory in connection with

symbolic interactionism. That being said, I found that Mouratoglou successfully delivers his role as a coach by fulfilling the analyzed aspects in his player-coach relationships.

Scholars in the field of communication can benefit from various aspects of the rhetorical evaluation of Mouratoglou's coaching style. Coaching, with its broad application and interdisciplinary roots, has advanced considerably in the past few decades (Griffiths & Campbell, 2009). The aim of coaching is to help individuals or groups become self-directed in their learning and development (Bennett & Bush, 2009). Coaching is concerned with improvement of an individual's cognitive and emotional self-regulation (Spence & Oades, 2011).

Considering this, it becomes clear that coaching on many levels matches the needed attributes of a teacher or any academic in the field who sees their mission in helping and enhancing other people's knowledge. Therefore, Peterson and Hicks (1996) have accurately defined coaching as "the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (p.14), which shares the same motives any academic may aspire to have.

Apart from that, my personal experience and my journey in tennis solidifies my understanding of the necessity of a coach in every athlete's journey. Especially as a tennis player, where at the end of the day, I must stand alone on the court, the role of a coach cannot be valued enough. I think the field will benefit in understanding what differentiates an "okay" coach from an exceptional coach, as both the rhetorical strategies and nonverbal communicative methods illustrated by Coach Patrick Mouratoglou can be directly translated into academic life.

References

Atkinson, J. and Feather, F. (1966) An introduction to motivation. Van Nostrand. Princeton

Audi R., Murphy P.E. The many faces of integrity, Business Ethics Quarterly, 16 (2006), pp. 3-21

Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Chovil, N., Lemery, C. R., & Mullett, J. (1988). Form and function in motor mimicry: Topographic evidence that the primary function is communicative. Human Communication Research, 14, 275-299.

Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., Bosch, J. A., & ThøgersenNtoumani, C. (2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: the role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37, 1459-1473.

Becker, M., & Talsma, J. (2016). Adding colours to the shades of grey: Enriching the integrity discourse with virtue ethics concepts. In A. Lawton, Z. van der Wal, & L. Huberts (Eds.), *Ethics in public policy and management: A global research companion* (pp. 33–50). London, England: Routledge.

Bennett, J., & Bush, M. W. (2009). Coaching in organizations: Current trends and future opportunities. *OD Practitioner*, 41(1), 1- 7.

Bernieri, F. J. (1988). Coordinated movement and rapport in teacher-student interactions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 12, 120-138.

Bluckert, P. (2005). Critical factors in executive coaching - the coaching relationship. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 37(7), 336-340.

Blumer H (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Butt, D.S. and Cox, D.N. (1992) Motivational patterns in Davis Cup, university and recreational tennis players. *International Journal of Sport Psychology* 23, 1-13.

Caldwell, C., & Jeane, L. (1970, January 1). Cam Caldwell & Lily Jeane, *Ethical Leadership and Building Trust-raising the bar for business*. PhilPapers. Retrieved December 2, 2022, from <https://philpapers.org/rec/CALELA>

Carter, Michael & Fuller, Celene. (2015). *Symbolic Interactionism*. Sociopedia.isa. 10.1177/205684601561.

Castaldo, S., Premazzi, K., & Zerbini, F. (2010). The meaning(s) of trust. A content analysis on the diverse conceptualizations of trust in scholarly research on business relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(4), 657-668. DOI: 10.1007/S10551-010-0491-4.

Charney, E. J. (1966). Postural configurations in psychotherapy. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 28, 305-315.

Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception-behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 893-910.

Crespo, M. and Miley, D. (1998) *Advanced Coaches Manual*. International Tennis Federation. ITF Ltd.London.

Collins R (2004) *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cox, Damian, Marguerite La Caze, and Michael Levine, "Integrity", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/integrity/>.

Deci, E., Eghrari, H., Patrick, B., & Leone, D. (1994). Facilitating internalization: the self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 62, 119-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00797.x>.

Denzin NK (1992) *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ergin, A., & Birol, C., (2005). *Eğitimde Özetim*. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara

Fresno Pacific University. (2021, August 12). Team sports vs. Individual sports: The advantages and disadvantages. Fresno Pacific University. Retrieved December 2, 2022, from <https://ce.fresno.edu/news/team-sports-vs-individual-sports-both-offer-lessons-to-students/>

Goffman E (1959b) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goman, C. K. (2010). *The nonverbal advantage: Secrets and science of body language at work*. Amazon. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from <https://www.amazon.com/Nonverbal-Advantage-Secrets-Language-Business/dp/1576754928>

Gouriellec, C. L. (2020, April 7). The story of the Patrick Mouratoglou Academy. Tennis World Live. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from <https://www.tennisworldlive.com/tennis-news/26466/patrick-mouratoglou-the-story-of-the-man-behind-the-academy/>

Gower, R. and Walters, S. (1983). *Teaching Practice Handbook*. Oxford: Heinemann

Gracz, J. and Sankowski, T. (1995) *Psychologia Sportu*. AWF Poznań.

Griffiths, K., & Campbell, M. (2009). Discovering, applying and integrating: The process of learning in coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 7(2), 16-30.

Hardin, R. (2006, April 5). Trust. Google Books. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from <https://books.google.com/books/about/Trust.html?id=XWwpRhX1tdsC>

Harry Weger Jr. , Gina R. Castle & Melissa C. Emmett (2010) Active Listening in Peer Interviews: The Influence of Message Paraphrasing on Perceptions of Listening Skill, *The Intl. Journal of Listening*, 24:1, 34-49.

Hatzakis, T. (2008). Towards a framework of trust attribution styles. *British Journal of Management* 20, 448-460.

House JS (1977) The three faces of social psychology. *Sociometry* 40(2): 161–77

Ives, Y. (2012). What is relationship coaching? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 10(2), 88-99.

Kenworthy, B. J., & Jones, J. (2009). The role of group importance and anxiety in predicting depersonalized ingroup trust. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12(2), 227-239.

Kim, P.H., Ferrin, D.L., Cooper, C.D., & Dirks, K.T. (2004). Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology versus denial for repairing competence-versus integrity-based trust violations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 104-118.

Kramer M. R. (1999). Trust and distrust in organization: emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review Psychology*, 50, 569-598.

Ledbury, R. et al., (2004). The Importance of Eye Contact in the Classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, VOL. X, No. 8 <http://iteslj.org>

Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. (2010). Leadership and trust: Their effect on knowledge sharing and team performance. *Management Learning*, 41(4), 473-491.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1985). The application of goal setting to sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 2005-222.

Lount, B. R. (2010). The impact of positive mood on trust in interpersonal and intergroup interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3), 420-433.

Lowe K.B., Cordery J., Morrison D. A model for the attribution of leader integrity: Peeking inside the black box of authentic leadership

Mageau GA, Vallerand RJ. The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sport Sciences*. 2003;21:883–904.

Markovic, J., McAtavey, J. M., & Fischweicher, P. (2014). An integrative trust model in the coaching context. *American Journal of Management*, 14(1-2), 102-110.

Mayer, C. R., Davis H. J., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.

Mead GH (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meltzer BN and Petras JW (1970) The Chicago and Iowa Schools of symbolic interactionism. In: Shibutani T (ed.) *Human Nature and Collective Behavior*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, pp. 3–17.

Mouratoglou, P. [Patrick Mouratoglou]. (2021, August 12). "Don't Listen to What they Say, Hear What they Think" [Video]. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uBTEWjQt-HM&list=PL7BhBmpnxG_JX3j9ai3WDhM4H-whbj-Tm.

Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal*, 25(3), 171–184.

Palmer, S., Wilkin, H., & Kerrin, M. (2008). The influence of character: Does personality impact coaching success? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(1), 32-42.

Parker, R., (2006) .Classroom Management. *Tesol Course Articles*.
<http://www.tesolcourse.com>

Pearce, W. B., & Brommell, B. J. (1971). Vocalic communication in persuasion. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, 298–306.

Pelletier, L., Seguin-Levesque, C., & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviours. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 186-196.

Peterson, D. B., & Hicks, M. D. (1996). *Leader as coach: Strategies for coaching and developing others*. Minneapolis, MN: Personnel Decisions International.

Pollitt, L., (2006) . Classroom Management. *Tesol Course Articles*.
<http://www.tesolcourse.com>

Rachels J. *The elements of moral philosophy*, (4th ed.), McGraw Hill, New York (2003).

Reina, S. D., & Reina, L. M. (2006). *Trust and betrayal in the workplace: Building effective relationships in your organization*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Righetti, F., & Finkenauer, C. (2011). If you are able to control yourself, I will trust you: The role of perceived self-control in interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(5), 874-886.

Sage, G. (1977). *Introduction to motor behavior: A neurophysiological approach* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Santrock, J., (2001). *Educational Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, C. R., & Davis, H. J. (1996). Including versus excluding ability form the definition of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(2). 339.

Schönborn, R. (1984) Leistungslimitierende und Leistungsbestimmende Faktoren. In: *Talentsuche und Talent Förderung im Tennis*. Ed: Gabler, H. and Zein, B. Beitrage vom 1. Symposium des Sportwissenschaftlichen Beirats des DTB 1983. Ahrensburg bei Hamburg, Czwalina, 51-75. (In German)

Simons T.L. Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus, *Organization Science*, 13 (2002), pp. 18-35.

Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh J., & Sabol, B. (2002) Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66, 15-37.

Spence, G. B., & Oades, L. G. (2011). Coaching with self-determination in mind: Using theory to advance evidence-based coaching practice. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 9(2), 37-55.

Stewart, L. J., Palmer, S., Wilkin, H., & Kerrin, M. (2008). The influence of character: Does personality impact coaching success? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(1), 32-42.

Stryker S (2008) From Mead to a structural symbolic interactionism and beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 15–31.

Stryker S (1980) *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Sullivan, P. A. (1993). Communication skills training for interactive sports. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7, 79-91.

Taylor, J. (1994) Pre-match routines. *International Tennis Federation Coaches Review* 4, 11.

Thomas WI (1931) *The definition of the situation. The Unadjusted Girl*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, pp. 41–50.

Trenholm, S., & Jensen, A. (2004). *Interpersonal communication*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Turner RH (1962) Role-taking: Process versus conformity. In: Rose A (ed.) *Human Behavior and Social Process: An Interactionist Approach*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin

Turner RH (1956) Role-taking, role standpoint, and reference-group behavior. *American Journal of Sociology* 61(4): 316–28.

Turner RH (1968) Social roles: Sociological aspects. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 552–6.

Unierzyski P. Level of achievement motivation of young tennis players and their future progress. *J Sports Sci Med*. 2003 Dec 1;2(4):184-6. PMID: 24688282; PMCID: PMC3963254.

Van Genderen, Eric, E. V. G. M. B. A. M. I. ADipC, and DBA FRSA. "The inner game of executive coaching: Integrity, leadership, and change." *GLOBE* (2002): 40.

The Playbook: A Coach's Rules for Life: Netflix official site. Watch The Playbook | Netflix Official Site. (2020, September 22). Retrieved December 2, 2022, from <https://www.netflix.com/watch/81145067?trackId=255824129>

Weinberg, R.S. (1988) *The mental advantage*. Human Kinetics Publishers. Champaign IL

Williams, Bernard, 1973. 'Integrity,' in J.J.C. Smart and Bernard Williams (eds.), *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 108–117.

YouTube. (2022, February 10). Serena Williams' practice at the Mouratoglou Academy. YouTube. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1UzskZk1MRw&t=355s&ab_channel=PatrickMouratoglou

YouTube. (2022, March 15). How to manage stress in match? | tennis mental talk. YouTube. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iJNHtJN1mY8&ab_channel=PatrickMouratoglou

YouTube. (2019, May 26). Tennistory: Patrick Mouratoglou. YouTube. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cw2rI7I-34Y&t=210s&ab_channel=TennisChannel

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Jurabek Karimov

Department of Communication
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, 27106
NC

EDUCATION

Graduating 05/2023	Master of Arts , Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC
Graduated 05/2021	Bachelor in Physical Culture , University of Tashkent, Uzbekistan

WORK EXPERIENCE

01/2016 – Present	Tennis Coach • Worked with different players from different cultures • Coaching experience in Uzbekistan and America • Assisting in lessons and instructions
01/2015 – 08/2021	Professional Tennis Player • Played in all four Grand Slams as a Junior • Career high of #426 in Singles and #278 in Doubles • Represented Uzbekistan in the Davis Cup

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

01/2022 – 05/2023	Master's Thesis , Wake Forest Department of Communication • Advisor: Nate French, PhD • Title: Coach Patrick Mouratoglou – A Rhetorical Analysis
-------------------	---

SKILLS

- Fluent in Russian and English
- Flourishing in team environments through experience in athletics
- Developed leadership skills as the top player of the Wake Forest men's tennis team
- Worked with diverse groups of people
- Advanced writing skills in Russian and English
- Capable of managing pressure situations through experience in athletics

OTHER

08/2021 – 05/2023

Wake Forest Men's Tennis Team

- All ACC Third Team
- Played at #1 spot singles and doubles

01/2015 – 05/2021

World Tennis Tour – Juniors and Professionals

- Best tennis player in Asia under 14, 16 and 18
- Participated in four Grand Slam tournaments
- 2016 Australian Open Finalist
- Junior ranking as high as #6 in the world under 18
- Represented national team of Uzbekistan in 2016 Davis Cup
- Quarterfinalist of the 2018 Davis Cup with Uzbekistan
- Career high ranking singles: #426
- Career high ranking doubles: #278